



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

'ΑΠὸ ΚΟΙΝΟῦ IN GUDRUN

The term ἀπὸ κοινοῦ is first used in a syntactical sense by Apollonius in his *De Constructionibus*, where he cites as an example Διονύσιος περιπατεῖ καὶ Απολλώνιος.* Modern grammar, however, has restricted the term to a more specific and technical use. A definition of the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction depends upon the definer's view-point as to its nature and origin. Panzer in his *Hilde-Gudrun* considers it a "syntaktische Verschränkung," in which two constructions cross at a common point. Kellner (*Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, §§110, 111, 274) treats ἀπὸ κοινοῦ under the head of adjective clauses with the relative pronoun omitted, but distinguishes it from a construction where the apparently relative clause *may* be looked upon as an independent sentence. He does not admit ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in a sentence like *se faeder hire sealde áne þeówene Bala hátte*, "the father gave her a servant was called Bala" (*Genesis*, XXIX, 29). In this sentence a period after *þeówene* would make *Bala hátte* an independent sentence: "the father gave her a servant. Bala was she called."

Paul in his *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik* (§385) gives a double-headed definition which, however, seems to cover the case better than either of those given above. He says that ἀπὸ κοινοῦ is a part of a sentence which belongs equally to two co-ordinate sentences, placed in the middle between the two without a copulative particle. He defines another kind of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ as that construction which exists when some part of the principal clause acts also as the subject in a logically, tho not formally, dependent clause; e. g. *under einer banier grüne, was mit golde durchleit* (Alphart), *wër was ein man lac vor dëm Grâl* (Wolfram).

The difficulty with all of the above definitions is that none of them is broad enuf to cover all the examples that are ad-

* Notice Sanskrit *kākāksivat*, "in the manner of a crow's eye," used of a word which appears only once in a sentence, but which applies to two portions of it, both the preceding and the subsequent. Crows are supposed by the Hindus to have only one eyeball, which, as occasion requires, moves from the cavity on one side into that on the other.

mitedly ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. The same difficulty is met in the various attempts to trace the origin of the construction. Kellner apparently claims that ἀπὸ κοινοῦ originated in the omission of a relative. His discussion of the subject is headed "The oldest Stage of the Adjective Clause (Omission of the Relative Pronoun)" and in his examples of the starting point of the construction he inserts in each case a relative in brackets. The more generally accepted view is that ἀπὸ κοινοῦ had its origin in anacoluthon.

Neither of these explanations of the origin of the construction satisfies all the indisputable cases of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, and one is driven to the conclusion that the construction may have arisen, and probably did arise, in several different ways. When one reads in Shelley, "I know a charm shall make thee meek and tame," or in *Winter's Tale* (V, I, 23), "You are one of those would have him wed again," one feels simply the omission of the relative pronoun, and in turning poetry to prose would read "I know a charm *that* shall make thee meek and tame," and "You are one of those *who* would have him wed again."

But with *Gudrun* 478 the feeling is different:

ir sult umbe sehen,
daz uns iht ergâhe hie in dirre marke
Hagene der ist grimme.

"You shall see to it
 that overtakes us not here in this country
 Hagen he is bold."

Here one feels that the author either consciously or unconsciously ignored the fact that he had already made *Hagene* the subject of one verb when he made it also the subject of *ist grimme*. Hence we conclude that in some cases ἀπὸ κοινοῦ is, in result, a species of anacoluthon or "grammatical break," which is, according to Sweet, "beginning with one grammatical construction and then changing to a different one, the result either of forgetting the grammatical form of the beginning, or of confusion of that caused by a complex arrangement of clauses." It is apparent that this "grammatical break" sometimes takes the form of the syntactical Janus that we call ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.

But there are cases in which it is impossible to believe that a relative pronoun ever existed and there are cases which could not have had their origin in anacoluthon. The quotation above (*Gudrun* 478) is an example in which insertion (or restoration, as Kellner would call it) of the relative is impossible. A relative cannot be inserted, nor can the demonstrative *der* be made a relative so long as the sentence stands in the order given to it by the manuscript.

There are other examples where the insertion of a relative is possible from a grammatical point of view, but where such insertion would not only spoil the sense, but would even produce nonsense. A case in point is *Gudrun* 706:

dar umbe muosten doln
diu her ze beiden siten wunden vil ir mâgen
gewunnen zallen ziten.

“therefore had to suffer
the armies on both sides many wounds their kinsmen
kept getting all the time.”

Inserting a relative pronoun in this sentence would be to say: “therefore had to suffer the armies on both sides many wounds *which* their kinsmen kept getting all the time.” Obviously “armies” and “kinsmen” could not receive the same wounds.

An attempt to reduce the origin of all ἀπὸ κοινοῦ constructions to anacoluthon leads to improbable conclusions, for the construction is found in sentences too short and direct to admit of its probability. To say that the construction of “It is thy sovereign speaks to thee” is (to again use Sweet’s definition of anacoluthon) the “result either of forgetting the grammatical form of the beginning or of confusion of that caused by a complex arrangement of clauses” is to credit the author with a marvellously short memory or a violent susceptibility to grammatical confusion.

Admitting that ἀπὸ κοινοῦ sometimes results from the omission of a relative pronoun and that in long, involved sentences it may be produced by anacoluthon, this paper would defend the thesis that the construction in certain cases, and originally perhaps in most cases, developed from subordination without relative pronouns—a period which immediately

followed parataxis—and that it existed thruout the usage as plain demonstratives of what later became relative pronouns. This latter stage is represented by the example mentioned above:

ir sult umbe sehen,
daz uns iht ergâhe hie in dirre marke
Hagene der ist grimme.

where we have an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in which the *der* that later became a relative is used in a demonstrative sense.

In such cases the construction may have developed in some such manner as the following:

1. Parataxis: *dô spranc von dem gesidele her Hagene. her Hagene alsô sprach.*

2. Subordination, which we may represent by parentheses: *dô spranc von dem gesidele her Hagene; (her Hagene alsô sprach)* or *(der alsô sprach)*. This subordination was originally not syntactical, but merely subordination in thought and expression.

3. Coalescence of two words which stood side by side and had the same meaning, resulting in what we call ἀπὸ κοινοῦ: *dô spranc von dem gesidele her Hagene alsô sprach.*

It might be possible to maintain that the existence of numerous ἀπὸ κοινοῦ's or anacolutha in the *Volksepos* is a mark of improvising. But even in cases where ἀπὸ κοινοῦ is apparently a conscious literary (usually poetic) device, its psychological background is often to be found in subordination and the consequent coalescence of similar elements. The construction is, naturally enough, more frequent in older and more popular poems than elsewhere. With more cultivated style the construction tends to disappear.

In *Gudrun* may be found 16 possible examples of regular ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction, altho no two critics agree as to the number, each editor differing from the others in the avoidance here and there of the construction thru varied punctuation and textual readings. The following arrangement of the examples in *Gudrun* follows a classification which is more or less a composite of those used by Panzer, Haupt and Kellner.

1. The common middle part acts as the subject of the two clauses.

314, ^{2, 3}

*sîn kraft und ouch sîn ellen sind stark und ouch sîn hant
hât uns gemachet âne maneger vröuden guot.*

This reading agrees with the manuscript and is cited by Panzer as an example of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, making *ouch sîn hant* part of the subject of *sint stark* and the subject of *hât gemachet*. Martin and Bartsch put a comma after *hant* and insert *er* before *hât*. Symons evades the construction by substituting *sîn sterke* for *sint stark* and changing *hât* to *hânt*, thus making *kraft, ellen, sterke* and *hant* all the subjects of *hânt*. However, the manuscript reading retaining the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction seems here the easiest and most natural.

478, ^{2, 3, 4}

*ir sult umbe sehen,
daz uns iht ergâhe hie in dirre marke
Hagene der ist grimme.*

Symons and Panzer consider *Hagene* as the subject of both *ist grimme* and *ergâhe*. Martin and Bartsch avoid ἀπὸ κοινοῦ by striking out *ist* and putting *der grimme* in apposition with *Hagene*.

538, ^{1, 2}

*Do er si und Hildeburge zuo im komen sach,
dô spranc von dem gesidele her Hagene alsô sprach :*

Martin, Symons, Bartsch, Panzer and Haupt all consider *her Hagene* as ἀπὸ κοινοῦ—the subject of *spranc* and *sprach*.

885, ^{1, 2}

*Sinen vater wolte rechen der küene Ortwin
dô kom mit grôzer menege und die helde sîn.*

This is the manuscript reading and is cited by Martin as an example of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, i. e. *der küene Ortwin* is the subject both of *wolte rechen* and *kom*. Symons has a period after *Ortwin* and inserts *Hôrant* between *menege* and *und* as the subject of *kom*, but is himself dissatisfied with the arrangement. Bartsch and Panzer agree with Symons in all except the dissatisfaction.

1024, ^{2, 3}

*deheiniu guotiu kleider tragen si enliez
Gêrlint sluoc si dicke.*

Martin and Panzer consider *Gêrlint* the subject of both

enliez and sluoc. Bartsch and Symons omit *sluoc* and substitute *diu übele* for *si dicke*.

1194, ^{3, 4}

sus kunde si bedenken

Gêrlint diu vil übele liez si ligen âne küsse ûf herten benken.

Bartsch, Panzer, Symons and Haupt consider *Gêrlint* the subject both of *kunde bedenken* and of *liez*. Martin also has the same reading, altho, probably thru an oversight, he does not include this case in his list of examples of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.

2. The common middle part functions as the object of both clauses.

92, ^{1, 2}

*Mit sîner bloeder krefte het er ûf gezogen
manic starke strâle schôz er ûz dem bogen.*

Bartsch, Symons, Martin and Panzer all regard *manic starke strâle* as the object both of *het ûf gezogen* and of *schôz*. Simrock in his translation supplies "bow" as the object of *het ûf gezogen*, but so far as the Middle High German text is concerned ἀπὸ κοινοῦ evidently cannot be avoided.

291, ^{1, 2, 3}

*Si giengen ûz den schiffen und truogen ûf den sant,
swes sô man bedorfte, veile man dâ vant,
und swes ieman gerte.*

Martin and Panzer treat *swes sô man bedorfte* as the object both of *truogen* and of *vant*. Martin says that to take *truogen* in an absolute sense would be to allow an ellipsis that could not be supplied. Bartsch and Symons have a period after *sant* and no punctuation after *bedorfte* nor after *vant*, thus allowing no ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. They consider *truogen* as used absolutely and supply some such object as *ir habe* or *ir dinc*. As the passage stands it is clearly ἀπὸ κοινοῦ and the emendation that requires *truogen* to be used absolutely is unnecessary and unconvincing.

303, ^{1, 2, 3}

*Dar brâhte man gesatelet zwelf kastelân
und ouch manege brünne und helme wol getân
hie� man mit in vüeren unde zwelf schilte,*

Panzer considers this ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, making *kastelân*, *brünne*, *helme* and *schilte* the objects of both *brâhte* and *vüeren*. But

Bartsch, Symons and Martin have a comma after *kastelân*, making it the object of *brâhte* alone. It seems well to accept such a slight emendation as the insertion of a comma at the end of a line, whenever in that way the looseness of the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction may be avoided without stretching or destroying the evident sense of the passage.

483, ⁴

er beslôz mit armen der schoenen lip vil sūezeclich er kuste.

Ettmüller, followed by Bartsch, Symons, Panzer and Haupt, treats *der schoenen lip* as the object of both *beslôz* and *kuste*. The manuscript, however, has *besloss sy*.

706, ^{2, 3, 4}

dar umbe muosten doln

diu her ze beiden siten wunden vil ir mâgen
gewunnen zallen ziten.

Panzer and Haupt take *wunden vil* as the object of *muosten doln* and of *gewunnen*. Bartsch, Symons and Martin avoid ἀπὸ κοινοῦ by means of a period after *siten* and the absolute use of *doln*. The position of *wunden vil* after the caesura might favor the latter interpretation, but it does not necessitate it. On the other hand, the reading with a period after *siten* might reasonably require the probably difficult demonstration of the use in the *Gudrun*, without an object, of *doln* in the sense of "suffer."

752, ^{1, 2}

Dô si nu getruogen und vuorten ab der fluot
vil schilde si besluogen und manegen helm guot.

Martin, Panzer and Symons construe *vil schilde* as the object both of *getruogen und vuorten* and of *besluogen*. Bartsch unnecessarily supplies some word for weapons with the first line.

853, ^{1, 2}

Dô sach der marnaere ûf den ünden wagen
ein schif mit richen segelen hiez er dem künege sagen.

Haupt alone considers this half-strophe an example of the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction. He takes *ein schif* as the object of both *sach* and *hiez sagen*. Bartsch, Martin and Symons have a period after *segelen*, and for *hiez er dem künege sagen* have *dem künege hiez erz sagen*.

3. The common middle part functions as the object of one clause and the subject of the other.

214, ^{2, 3}

hie� Hôranden bringen: dem ist wol erkant
alle site Hagenen hât er wol gesehen.

Panzer, Martin, Bartsch and Symons unite in considering this an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, taking *alle site Hagenen* as the subject of *ist erkant* and the object of *hât gesehen*.

654, ^{1, 2, 3}

Mit hundred sîner helde gieng er dâ er vant
gezweiet mit ir muoter von Hegelinge lant
Kûdrûn enphieng in mit anderen vrouwen.

Bartsch, Panzer, Symons, Martin and Haupt all construe *von Hegelinge lant Kûdrûn* as the object of *vant* and the subject of *enphieng*.

4. All cases of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ not provided for in the three other classes. Of this fourth class *Gudrun* offers but one possible example:

780, ^{3, 4}

zuo in ûz der veste
die Hetelen degene wolten slahen die vil werden geste.

Panzer considers this an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction where the subject and a part of the predicate (*die Hetelen degene wolten*) are common to two clauses. He apparently construes *wolten* both with an understood verb of motion and with *slahen* and regards *degene* as the common subject of both verbs. But Bartsch, Martin and Symons make *slahen* an infinitive of purpose, i. e. "to them from the fortress Hetele's thanes would (go) in order to slay the noble guests." This seems by far the more sensible arrangement.

Finally, it may be claimed that no conclusion in regard to genuine and spurious strophes may be reached from an investigation of the occurrence of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in *Gudrun*. The number of strophes in which the construction is found is too small to allow definite conclusions as to its distribution between genuine and spurious strophes. But even this small number shows no indication in either direction. Martin maintains that ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in *Gudrun* is found chiefly in spurious strophes. Martin's criterion of genuineness is Müllenhoff's

edition. Following this, we should expect, if the cases of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ were proportionately divided between genuine and spurious strophes, to find that 415/1705 of the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ strophes (considered as such by Martin, Panzer, Bartsch or Symons) were genuine. Instead, we find the proportion to be 3/16, making a difference of less than 1/16, that is to say, less than one strophe. Thus Martin's assertion would lead us to the conclusion that because we find that one more ἀπὸ κοινοῦ strophe is spurious than we expected to find from the proportion thruout the poem between genuine and spurious strophes, therefore ἀπὸ κοινοῦ is found chiefly in spurious strophes—a conclusion that is obviously a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Princeton University.

HAROLD H. BENDER.